EXHIBIT 1

Pages 1 - 93

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. ORRICK, MAGISTRATE JUDGE

)

)

IN RE: JUUL LABS, INC.,
MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES,
AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY
LITIGATION.

) No. 19-md-02913 WHO

San Francisco, California Wednesday, February 16, 2022

TRANSCRIPT OF VIDEOCONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES: (via Zoom Video Conferencing)

For Plaintiffs:

LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3339

BY: SARAH R. LONDON, ESQ.
REILLY T. STOLER, ESQ.
ANDREW KAUFMAN, ESQ.

GIRARD SHARP 601 California Street, Suite 1400 San Francisco, California 94108

BY: DENA C. SHARP, ESQ.

KELLER ROHRBACK LLP 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3200 Seattle, Washington 98101-3052

BY: DEAN KAWAMOTO, ESQ.

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

Reported By: Marla F. Knox, RPR, CRR, RMR

Official Reporter - U.S. District Court

1	<u>APPEARANCES</u> : (continued, via Zoom)	
2	For Plaintiffs:	
3	WEITZ & LUXENBERG, P.C. 700 Broadway New York, New York 10003	
4	BY: ELLEN RELKIN, ESQ.	
5	LEVIN SEDRAN & BERMAN LLP 510 Walnut Street - 5th Floor	
6	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106 BY: KEITH L. VERRIER, ESQ.	
7	For Defendant Juul Labs, Inc.:	
8	KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP	
9	300 North LaSalle Chicago, Illinois 60654	
10	BY: RENEE D. SMITH, ESQ.	
11	KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP 1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW	
12	Washington, D.C. 20004 BY: DAVID M. BERNICK, ESQ.	
13	JASON M. WILCOX, ESQ.	
14	MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON LLP 350 S. Grand Avenue, 50th Floor	
15	Los Angeles, California 90071 BY: GREGORY P. STONE, ESQ.	
16	For Defendants Altria Group, Inc. and Philip Morris USA Inc.:	
17	ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP	
18	601 Massachusetts Ave, NW Washington, D.C. 20001-3743	
19	BY: JOHN C. MASSARO, ESQ.	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

been covered, and as far as I can tell in every round of briefing in this case.

Noerr-Pennington does not apply to deliberate attempts to mislead the FDA. We have put the cases. Your Honor has seen them. We have had rulings on it. We don't need to cover that territory again.

Regardless of its applicability to any claims of direct liability, Altria's efforts with the JLI and the FDA are evidence of aiding and abetting, intent and knowledge, as well as conspiracy.

So even if we have a Noerr-Pennington problem here, that doesn't eliminate those actions from the case -- that evidence from the case; and we can talk about that down the line.

And there is no Buckman claim here. The duty is to avoid aiding and abetting a known tort feasor not to refrain from deceiving the FDA.

Finally turning to the Tennessee Products Liability Act,

Altria has no authority -- literally no authority -- for the

proposition that the TPLA eliminates common law claims against

it. Nothing in the text says so.

Altria cites no legislative history. There is no case.

Look at the cites in their reply brief, some of which

Mr. Massaro talked about today.

They cite a treatise on comparative fault that actually says if you look at it, that the TPLA is, quote, not a